DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 752 HE 005 825

AUTHOR Woodruff, Kevin; Fuller, Bruce
TITLE Student Vote 1974. An Analysis of Student Voting Patterns in the June, 1974 Primary Election.
INSTITUTION California Univ. Student Lobby, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 27p.
AVAILABLE FROM Student Lobby, 926 J Street, Room 216, Sacramento, California 95814 ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Higher Education; *Local Issues; Political Attitudes; Statistical Data; *Student Participation; *Students; *Voting
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This analysis of the impact of the student vote in the June 1974 primary election is one in a series of reports, and represents the University of California Student Lobby's continuing effort to provide information on the voting behavior of students. Student voting patterns in contested statewide and local races were examined, along with voter registration and turnout patterns. The data were obtained by examining election results in "student precincts;" that is, precincts on or near college campuses in which a high percentage of residents are students. The political preferences of 35,000 students living in 78 student precincts on or near 21 California colleges and universities were studied. Statistical tables accompany the text. (Author/PG)

ED 095752

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STUDENT VOTE 1974

An Analysis of Student Voting Patterns in the June, 1974 Primary Election

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

August, 1974

Prepared for the University of California Student Lobby by:
Kevin Woodruff
Bruce Fuller

HE 005 825

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

U.C. Tie Line: 128-20206

STUDENT LOBBY

(916) 442-3827
926 J Street, Rm. 216
Sacramento, California 95814

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

September 5, 1974

Dear Friend;

I thought this study on the student voting turnout in the June California Primary might be of interest to you. If you would like other copies please send $2.50 to cover cost of printing and postage.

Sincerely,

Linda Bond

Linda Bond
Co-Director

McCloskey's Victory Tied to Student Vote

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Credits Win in 11 Stanford Precincts for Success in Primary

Los Angeles Times
CC PART II †
MONDAY, JULY 5, 1970

BY KENNETH REICH
Times Political Writer

An examination of voting patterns in 61 precincts populated preponderantly by students at 13 college campuses in the state indicates that student votes were decisive in at least one situation in the June 4 primary election.

This was in maverick Republican Rep. Paul N. McCloskey Jr.'s narrow victory over Gordon Knapp for the Republican congressional nomination in McCloskey's Bay Area district.

The survey of voting by the University of California Student Lobby showed that had not Stanford students by the hundreds registered Republican and voted more than 90% for McCloskey, Knapp, a conservative Republican, would have won.

GOP registration in 11 Stanford precincts increased 80% between January and May. Turnout among these student Republicans was 67.3%, the Student Lobby found, and McCloskey received 90.7% of the vote to Knapp's 7.8%.

McCloskey, a vehement foe of President Nixon, won these precincts by nearly 1,200 votes, although his district-wide margin for the Republican nomination was only 867 votes.

The Student Lobby's study also showed that student voters favored former Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti over all other Democratic gubernatorial contenders by a clear margin in the June 4 primary.

Moretti won a plurality of votes at nine of the 13 campuses whose voting patterns were examined, while Secretary of State Edmund G. Brown Jr., who won the Democratic nomination, had a plurality in only two.

State Controller Houston I. Flournoy, the Republican gubernatorial nominee, won the most support from students at 12 of the 13 campuses examined in his contest with Lt. Gov. Ed Reinecke.

The survey of voting patterns showed that Moretti had won pluralities at UC Berkeley, UCLA, UC Davis, UC San Diego, UC Santa Barbara, UC Riverside, USC, Occidental and the Claremont Colleges. Moretti's percentage of the total Democratic vote varied as high as an actual majority of 55% at UC Santa Barbara. But among Democratic voters in the state as a whole, Moretti ran third in the primary.

Brown captured pluralities at Caltech and Loyola. His high percentage was 38.1% at Caltech.

The other two campuses examined — UC Santa Cruz and Stanford University—went by a plurality for Rep. Jerome R. Waldie—who ran fifth in the overall statewide primary balloting. Waldie's high was 39% at Santa Cruz.

The man who ran second in the Democratic primary—San Francisco Mayor Joseph L. Alioto—made a miserable showing on the campuses, never getting any more than 9% of the total vote and in several cases getting less than 4%.

On the Republican side, Flournoy rolled up heavy margins at every campus but Loyola, where he and Reinecke ended in a virtual tie. Flournoy's best showing was at UC Davis, where he received 86% of the total GOP vote cast.

The Student Lobby examination of voting patterns revealed that on several campuses which had not dismissed classes before the primary, the voter turnout was greater than the average turnout of 47% in the general population.

Among the other findings of the precinct examination:

—State Sen. Mervyn Dymally received more student votes than USC law professor Howard Miller for the Democratic nomination for lieutenant governor.

—Students also favored the winning Republican nominee for lieutenant governor, state Sen. John L. Harmer, over his rival, former Assemblyman John G. Veneman.

—The student vote in favor of the political campaign reform initiative, Proposition 9, ranged from an affirmative vote of 80.4% at USC to a high affirmative vote of 95.5% at UC Santa Barbara.

Introduction & Methodology

This analysis of the impact of the student vote in the June, 1974 primary election is one in a series of reports, and represents the University of California Student Lobby's continuing effort to provide information on the voting behavior of students. Student voting patterns in contested statewide and local races were examined, along with voter registration and turnout patterns.

The data were obtained by examining election results in "student precincts;" that is, precincts on or near college campuses in which a high percentage of residents are students.[1] The political preferences of 35,000 students living in 78 student precincts on or near 21 California colleges and universities were studied. The results of the analysis are summarized in 11 tables beginning on page 13.

Two limitations of the study methodology should be noted. First, many private colleges and state college campuses were either in the middle of final examinations or had already adjourned by June 4. The voter turnout at these campuses was very low, and possibly included a high percentage of non-student voters. As it is likely that non-students living in student precincts generally share students' political opinions, these precincts have been included. We have indicated those campuses which were not in full session.

---

1. For a more detailed discussion of methodology utilized, see California Student Vote: 1972, UC Student Lobby, Sacramento.

Second, at many campuses only one or two student precincts could be isolated, resulting in a small and possibly non-representative sample of voters. Such data does, however, provide an indication of how students on smaller campuses voted on June 4. Precincts surrounding those schools with near-completed or completed academic terms on June 4, and those schools where only one or two student precincts were surveyed are identified in Table 2.

Turnout and Registration

Students continue to register predominantly as Democrats. Democratic registration ranged from a low of 49.6% at the Pomona precinct to a high of 78.8% at UC Santa Cruz. At only four of the 21 campuses did Democratic registration fall below the statewide registration figure for all voters of 56.2%. Republican registration exceeded the statewide mark of 36.8% at Stanford[2] and Pomona, and ranged as low as 4.9% at UC Santa Cruz.

Students at every campus showed a tendency to shun the two major political parties. The percentage of student voters declining to state a party affiliation substantially exceeded the statewide figure of 5.8%. Percentages ranged from 8.9% at Stanford[2] to 26.0% in the one Cal Tech precinct. This trend away from party affiliation is increasing on campuses, as it is nationally among the general population. The percentage

---

2. Republican registration at Stanford was exceptionally high because many Democrats and independents reregistered as Republicans to vote for Paul McCloskey in his primary race.

of students declining to state a party preference has increased significantly since November 1972, while student affiliation with both the Democratic and Republican parties has declined.

Students shared the general feeling of apathy toward the June 4 election. Overall statewide turnout was 54.0%, well below the historic, average figure for non-presidential primaries of 64% predicted by the Secretary of State. Student turnout in the precincts surrounding the 11 colleges which were holding final exams or were out of session was, of course, far below this figure. Student turnout at the 10 campuses still meeting averaged below 54.0%; UC Santa Cruz exceeded this with a turnout figure of 63.1% (Table 2).

However, due to the high rate of transiency among students, raw turnout figures are deceptive when assessing voter turnout. Voting rolls were last purged in November, 1972. Since then many registered student voters had moved from their precincts while remaining on the voter rolls. Additionally, new students had moved into student precincts and had registered to vote. As a result, many more voters are now registered in student precincts than actually live or vote there. This inflated registration figure results in raw turnout figures that indicate lower than actual turnout patterns.

Devising an accurate method of adjusting raw registration figures to reflect actual numbers of registered students is difficult. However, data suggest that a general approximation can be achieved by reducing by 15% the number of registered voters in a precinct before calculating actual student turnout. After adjusting raw turnout figures, student turnout at two

of the ten colleges in session appears to be higher than the statewide rate of 54.0% (Table 2).

Democratic students had a higher turnout than Republican students, although Republicans statewide have traditionally voted in greater numbers than Democrats. On the 14 campuses where partisan turnout figures were available, Democratic turnout was higher at 11, and Republican turnout was greater at three. This lower Republican turnout may be attributed to disillusionment arising from Watergate and the better organizing activities among campus Democrats than among campus Republicans.

Voting Results

Democratic Statewide Races

Democratic students split their votes among liberal Democrats and shunned more moderate candidates in balloting for statewide offices.

In the gubernatorial primary, for example, former Assembly Speaker Bob Moretti garnered more student votes than this rivals, winning pluralities at 11 of the 21 campuses studied, including UC Berkeley and UCLA. Secretary of State Edmund G. Brown, Jr. won at 7 of the 21 campuses, Congressman Jerome Waldie was the strongest candidate at two. San Francisco Mayor Joseph Alioto received less than his statewide share of 18.9% at every campus but USF, and received less than 5% of the student vote at 14 campuses. Moretti received more than his statewide total of 16.7% at 17 campuses. Roth, although failing to carry any campus, received more than his statewide share of 10.3% at 14

campuses and Waldie ran ahead of his statewide tally of 7.6% at 16 campuses. Brown, despite winning at seven campuses, ran ahead of his statewide total of 37.8% at only three of the 21 campuses. Brown demonstrated a lack of appeal to students relative to his statewide appeal, while Moretti, Roth, and Waldie ran better on campuses than statewide.

Two trends in these results are worth noting. The first is Brown's relatively poor showing. Brown did not share the "pro-student" image enjoyed by Moretti, Roth and Waldie. Roth and Waldie were considered "more liberal," and therefore more appealing. Moretti's record as Assembly Speaker and UC Regent has appeared "pro-student," drawing favorable campus press coverage and several campus newspaper endorsements. Brown, although liberal, was apparently not able to convince students that he would represent their interests.

The second interesting trend is Moretti's strong showing on campuses over the "more liberal" Roth and Waldie. Moretti's impressive showing may be due in part to superior organization and name recognition. But Moretti also received support from students as a "practical choice." Students who preferred Roth or Waldie, but felt neither had a chance, chose Moretti from among the three frontrunners. Brown's apparent lack of appeal and Moretti's strong stand on student issues appear to have sharpened the distinction between the two candidates.

In other states races, student Democrats again preferred liberal candidates. For the Democratic nomination for Lieutenant Governor, State Senator Mervyn Dymally won 14 of the 21 campuses examined, with liberal USC Law professor Howard

Miller winning five campuses. Although Miller was billed as the "most liberal" candidate, Dymally is anything but conservative, and his superior name recognition and campaign may have attracted student voters away from Miller. Both Dymally and Miller ran ahead of their statewide percentages on most campuses. Moderate State Senator Lawrence Walsh ran poorly on campuses, winning none, despite his second-place finish statewide. At all but two campuses, Walsh ran behind his statewide total of 24.4% of the Democratic vote. Although data is not complete on the showing of the relatively unknown fourth-place finisher, feminist candidate Elizabeth Smith Weingand, she managed to outpoll Walsh on many campuses.

Bill Norris outpolled his more moderate rival Vincent Bugliosi in the race for the Attorney General nomination. Norris won 17 of the 21 campuses studied, running ahead of his statewide tally of 57.7% of 13 of these schools.

For the nomination for Secretary of State, winner March Fong and 3rd-place finisher Cathy O'Neill ran very close on college campuses, each winning at 10 of the 21 campuses examined. Second-place finisher Walter Karabian ran a poor third on campuses, falling behind his statewide total of 27.0% on all but two campuses. Although O'Neill was often considered more "liberal" than Fong, the general appeal of women candidates to students may have minimized the perceived differences between the two. Support varied geographically, with Oakland resident Fong running strongest at northern campuses, Los Angeles resident O'Neill running strongest at southern campuses.

San Francisco Supervisor Bob Mendelsohn captured more

student votes than his successful rival, Ken Cory, for the Controller's bid. Mendelsohn won 15 campuses and ran ahead of his statewide total of 32.5% at all but one campus. Cory won only 5 campuses and ran behind his statewide total of 44.5% at all but 3 campuses.

Jesse Unruh outpolled Gray Davis on campuses for the nomination for Treasurer. Davis, despite his liberal leanings, could not overcome Unruh's name indentification. Davis outpolled more moderate State Senator Alan Short on campuses, although Davis and Short ended in a virtual dead-heat for second place statewide.

In summation, Democratic students exhibited strong liberal tendencies, denying moderate candidates support at the polls. In the gubernatorial race students showed clear signs of favoring candidates who had established a strong record on student issues.

Republican Statewide Races

Republican students did not appear to favor moderate candidates despite some analysts' predictions of success for the moderate wing of the Republican party.

Moderate State Controller Houston Flournoy won at virtually every campus examined, but ran ahead of his statewide total of 63.2% at only 10 of the 19 campuses surveyed. Although Ed Reinecke ran very poorly, data suggest that this can be attributed more to his federal indictment than his conservative views.

Conservative State Senator John Harmer outpolled his more moderate rival John Veneman for the Republican nomination

for Lieutenant Governor on 13 campuses to Veneman's five. Harmer actually fared better on campuses than he did statewide.

Conservative State Senator H.L. Richardson also outpolled less conservative Earl Brian on 18 of the 19 campuses examined for the U.S. Senatorial nomination, although Richardson's margins on campuses were generally not as great as they were statewide.

Brian Van Camp defeated the more conservative Mike Montgomery on campuses, as he did in the statewide primary, winning 12 campuses to Montgomery's six. Montgomery did not generally fare better among college Republicans than he did statewide, running ahead of his statewide total of 34% on only 9 campuses.

The liberal William Bagley won on college campuses in his race for Controller, gaining pluralities at 10 campuses, compared to the more conservative James Flournoy's five and the conservative LaFollette's three. However, Bagley's percentage on campuses exceeded his statewide figure of 51.8% at only four campuses, while Flournoy and LaFollette ran ahead of their statewide percentages of 28.7% and 19.5% at 12 and 13 campuses respectively.

Thus, there is no clear moderate or conservative trend observable among college Republicans. In every race, campus Republicans, unlike Democratic students, voted as did the Republican party as a whole. The extremely conservative State Senators Harmer and Richardson did not suffer for their views among student Republicans, both easily defeating their less conservative opponents. If college Republicans are

becoming more liberal, they did not demonstrate such a shift on June 4.

Student Republicans, a small group, were not the targets of concentrated campaigning nor were they as well organized as their Democratic counterparts. This may have meant that college Republicans knew less about the candidates, and were influenced more by name recognition and less by issue-appeal than did student Democrats. Therefore, if a conservative Republican candidate made a concerted effort to get student Republican votes, he might find that he had tapped a latent conservative vote. The same could prove true, however, for a moderate Republican who was a vigorous campaigner. Liberal or conservative tendenices among student Republicans might better be detected by examining local contested elections.

The high rate of Democratic registration on campuses along with the liberal preferences of student non-partisans suggest that the liberal Democrats who ran well in the primary will achieve lopsided majorities in campus precincts this November. This will hold especially true for Dymally and Cranston who face the very conservative Harmer and Richardson.

However, Brown and Cory, two Democratic nominees who ran relatively po rly on campuses, will, coincidentally, face the two most moderate Republican candidates, Flournoy and Bagley. Although it is likely that both Brown and Cory will win heavily in student precincts, they may very likely run behind the rest of the Democratic ticket; Flournoy and Bagley will likely have more appeal to student voters than the remainder of the Republican ticket. In addition, student interest and

turnout may be lower for these two races than it would have been had more appealing Democrats or more conservative Republicans been nominated.

Brown and Cory might gain student votes and increase student turnout by campaigning on campuses and by drawing sharp distinctions between themselves and their opponents, particularly on "student issues." Brown and Cory may also increase their vote totals if they associate themselves with appealing statewide or local candidates when campaigning on campuses.

Flournoy and Bagley might increase their share of the student vote if they are willing to take more liberal positions, especially on student issues, and if they are willing to campaign directly for student votes. Very liberal Republican candidates have outpolled Democratic rivals in heavily Democratic student precincts in the past; Flournoy and Bagley are unlikely to do this, but they can at least increase their share of the student vote between now and November. Both the Brown-Flournoy and Cory-Bagley races may be close; thus, student votes might be crucial in determining the outcome of these statewide races.

State Propositions

Students supported Propositions 1,2,5,7 and 9. These five ballot measures examined were supported by margins greater than the general statewide population.

Student approval of Proposition 1, the parks and recreation bond measure, ranged from a low of a 76.6% affirmative vote at San Francisco State to a 96.3% yes vote at UC Santa

Cruz. The favorable plurality on Proposition 1 statewide was 59.9%. On Proposition 2, the clean water bond act, student approval ranged from 83.6% at S.F. State to 99.0% at UC Santa Cruz, compared to statewide approval of 70.5%. Ths mass transit measure, Proposition 5, received a low of 69.5% approval at Chico State to a high of 98.0% at UC Santa Cruz, compared to a statewide 'Yes' vote of 60.3%.

Students also gave overwhelming approval to Proposition 9, the controversial "political reform initiative." Affirmative votes ranged from 80.0% at Chico State to 97.3% at UC Santa Cruz, compared to a statewide 'Yes' vote of 69.8%.

Proposition 7, which would have granted civil service exemptions for officers of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, was also heavily supported by students. Proposition 7 lost only at Chico State by a 49.8%/50.2% margin, and won with 'Yes' votes ranging up to 78.7% at Stanford and 82.3% at UC Berkeley.

A similar proposition will be on the November ballot as Proposition 3. Proposition 7 lost by only a 47.2% 'Yes' to 52.8% 'No' statewide margin. With all schools back in session, and with a more vigorous campaign, Proposition 3 should receive substantial support among students this November.

Local Races

On the 21 campuses examined, students voted in 94 separate local Democratic and Republican Congressional, State Senatorial and Assembly primary elections. Forty-one of these primaries had one uncontested candidate. In thirty-

eight of the remaining 53 races the student vote for a major candidate varied by at least 10% from the district-wide margin. This provides further evidence that student voting patterns are substantially different from those of the general electorate. Twelve of the most significant local races are listed in Table 9.

The most dramatic effect of the student vote on June 4 was demonstrated by Republican Congressman Paul McCloskey's successful primary re-election bid. Student Votes provided the margin of victory for McCloskey. In the 11 Stanford University precincts examined between January and May 3, 1974, Republican registration increased by 78.5% while Democratic registration dropped by 4.8%, indicating that many student Democrats were registering Republican, as the McCloskey campaign had urged. Turnout of these newly-registered "Republicans" in the primary was a very high 67.3%, compared to a Democratic turnout of 41.5%. Further, of the 1428 students voting in the Republican primary in these precincts, all but eight, or 99.4%, voted in the Congressional race. Only 1232, or 86.3%, voted in the gubernatorial contest, which traditionally attracts the greatest number of voters. This indicates that the students' major interest in re-registering and voting as Republicans was the protection of McCloskey's seat in Congress. Of these 1420 voters, 1288, or 90.7%, voted for McCloskey, while only 111, or 7.8%, voted for McCloskey's conservative challenger, Gordon Knapp. This 1177 vote margin for McCloskey recorded in the 11 student precincts was significantly greater than his district-wide margin of 867 votes. Student votes clearly provided the difference between victory and defeat for McCloskey.

Table 1

Party Registration
(as of May 5, 1974)
(in percentage)

Campus	Democrat	Republican	P & F	AIP	DTS	Other
UCB	74.3	10.8	--	--	--	14.9[1]
UCLA	67.5	19.1	0.8	0.1	11.6	0.8
UCD	64.0	25.0	0.6	0.2	9.8	0.5
UCI	62.5	20.9	0.6	0.0	16.0	0.0
UCSD	60.8	18.0	1.0	0.3	18.6	1.3
UCSB	71.5	10.1	--	--	--	18.4[1]
UCR	62.8	19.4	1.4	0.0	15.2	1.1
UCSC	78.8	4.9	1.6	0.2	14.1	0.4
Chico	58.3	23.0	1.6	0.1	--	17.0[2]
Fullerton	61.2	21.7	0.0	0.0	17.1	0.0
Sacramento	65.6	21.5	1.0	0.3	--	11.6
San Francisco	65.1	21.9	0.8	0.4	9.9	1.8
San Jose	66.3	16.8	1.4	0.2	13.8	1.3
USC	53.0	24.1	0.0	0.0	22.4	0.5
Cal Tech	54.4	19.3	0.3	0.0	26.0	0.0
Occidental	64.7	17.1	0.7	0.7	15.9	0.9
Claremont	63.0	18.5	0.4	0.0	17.6	0.5
Pomona	49.6	37.2	0.9	0.4	11.1	0.9
Stanford[3]	50.6	39.7	0.3	0.0	8.9	0.4
Loyola	63.3	22.5	0.3	0.2	13.2	0.6
USF	66.1	18.5	0.2	0.2	11.7	3.3

1. P & F, AIP, and Declines to State are included in this category

2. Decline to State is included in this category

3. This compares to registration of 61.9% Democratic and 26.5% Republican in November 1972.

Table 2

Student Turnout

Campus	Number of Precincts	Number of Voters	Last Day of Finals	Total Turnout	Adjusted Turnout[1]	Democratic Turnout	Republican Turnout
UCB	12	2437	6/15	42.8	50.4	47.0	39.2
UCLA	7	1331	6/15	41.4	48.8	46.2	36.6
UCD	7	1771	6/15	44.8	52.7	50.0	38.6
UCI	2	380	6/15	29.8	35.1	NA	NA
UCSD	4	624	6/15	40.5	47.6	NA	NA
UCSB	12	2750	6/15	43.0	50.6	NA	NA
UCR	2	370	6/15	44.4	52.3	50.3	37.6
UCSC	6	1741	6/15	63.1	74.3	65.3	55.2
Chico[2]	1	313	5/31	19.5	---	NA	NA
Fullerton[2]	2	23	6/1	17.8	---	NA	NA
Sacramento[2]	1	73	6/7	23.5	---	30.0	6.0
San Francisco[2]	1	149	6/1	30.2	---	NA	NA
San Jose[2]	3	193	6/6	18.6	---	18.7	22.3
USC [2]	1	92	6/4	22.7	---	25.1	24.5
Cal Tech	1	114	6/15	33.3	39.2	35.5	45.4
Occidental[2]	1	180	6/4	31.8	---	36.0	32.0
Claremont[2]	1	222	6/8	28.5	---	31.6	30.6
Pomona[2]	1	52	6/8	22.2	---	22.4	20.7
Stanford	11	2645	6/12	49.5	58.3	41.5	67.3
Loyola[2]	1	237	6/7	36.2	---	42.3	33.3
USF[2]	1	96	5/25	17.6	---	NA	NA

1. The actual turnout figure is corrected for the high transiency rate of students by deflating the number of registered voters in student precincts by 15%.

2. As this campus was either in the middle of finals week or out of session on June 4, turnout is unusually low.

Table 3

Democratic & Republican
Gubernatorial Nominations

Campus	DEMOCRATIC						REPUBLICAN		
	Brown	Moretti	Alioto	Roth	Waldie	Others	Flournoy	Reinecke	Others
UCB	13.6	43.6	3.2	10.2	25.1	4.3	72.2	18.8	9.0
UCLA	22.4	32.0	2.4	27.1	13.2	2.9	66.7	23.6	9.7
UCD	14.4	34.7	3.7	28.1	15.4	3.7	82.2	13.2	4.6
UCI	36.0	29.8	3.5	8.5	17.4	4.6	68.1	20.8	11.1
UCSD	28.5	32.2	2.9	8.9	19.3	7.8	60.2	24.1	15.7
UCSB	9.8	55.0	1.5	16.4	14.6	2.6	58.8	26.3	14.9
UCR	34.2	39.8	2.4	6.9	11.8	4.9	62.5	23.2	14.3
UCSC	18.5	20.9	0.9	17.2	39.0	3.4	53.7	24.1	22.2
Chico	31.9	16.0	11.7	14.6	18.3	7.5	75.0	13.3	11.7
Fullerton[1]	58.8	17.6	11.8	11.8	0.0	0.0	----	omitted	----
Sacramento[1]	8.3	31.7	3.3	20.0	28.3	8.3	----	omitted	----
San Francisco	30.0	9.0	28.0	23.0	7.0	3.0	78.8	15.2	6.1
San Jose	19.8	37.3	7.9	16.7	11.1	7.1	48.6	29.7	21.6
USC	33.3	38.9	5.6	13.0	7.4	1.8	56.5	34.8	8.7
Cal Tech	38.1	27.0	1.6	12.7	6.4	14.3	51.9	37.0	11.1
Occidental	25.9	39.7	4.6	13.0	8.4	8.4	65.5	31.0	3.5
Claremont	22.8	31.5	2.0	14.1	18.8	10.7	69.0	26.2	4.8
Pomona	44.0	20.0	12.0	8.0	9.0	8.0	50.0	43.8	6.2
Stanford	19.3	15.8	4.4	22.6	35.3	2.5	80.6	11.3	8.0
Loyola	32.6	30.8	9.3	5.2	7.6	14.5	48.8	48.8	2.3
USF	25.8	4.5	51.5	6.1	9.0	3.0	70.0	25.0	5.0

1. The results from this precinct are omitted through the report because only 1 Republicans voted.

Table 4

Democratic & Republican
Nominations for Lieutenant-Governor

Campus	DEMOCRATIC				REPUBLICAN		
	Dymally	Miller	Walsh	Others	Harmer	Veneman	Others
UCB	54.4	17.8	7.4	20.4	57.3	42.2	0.5
UCLA	32.0	29.1	21.4	17.5	62.3	37.7	0
UCD	51.2	23.7	8.0	17.1	59.2	40.8	0
UCI	26.6	10.3	24.1	38.9	66.7	33.3	0
UCSD	31.6	25.2	14.0	29.1	61.7	38.3	0
UCSB	10.0	59.9	6.3	23.8	70.6	29.4	0
UCR	24.4	25.9	13.2	36.6	60.8	39.2	0
UCSC	40.2	30.0	3.8	26.0	48.8	51.2	0
Chico	31.0	9.2	16.8	42.9	41.1	58.9	0
Fullerton	25.0	25.0	12.5	37.5	----omitted----		
Sacramento	18.9	37.7	13.2	30.2	----omitted----		
San Francisco	37.9	12.6	11.5	37.9	56.5	43.5	0
San Jose	40.2	12.5	11.6	35.7	43.5	56.6	0
USC	24.5	36.7	14.3	24.5	72.7	27.3	0
Cal Tech	37.7	26.4	13.2	22.6	58.3	41.7	0
Occidental	35.2	21.9	13.3	29.5	51.8	48.2	0
Claremont	18.0	48.0	19.0	15.0	41.0	59.0	0
Ponoma	29.2	20.8	20.8	29.2	50.0	50.0	0
Stanford	28.7	42.3	7.5	21.4	33.6	66.4	0
Loyola	38.8	18.0	25.9	17.3	70.6	29.4	0
USF	46.2	11.5	28.8	13.5	66.7	33.3	0

Table 5

Campus	Democratic Nomination for Attorney General			Republican Nomination for U.S. Senator		
	Norris	Bugliosi	Others	Richardson	Brian	Others
UCB	68.3	31.3	0.4	54.1	26.5	19.4
UCLA	58.7	41.3	0	60.8	18.3	20.9
UCD	56.6	43.4	0	61.5	19.9	18.6
UCI	59.8	40.2	0	59.6	19.2	21.2
UCSD	64.5	35.5	0	56.8	17.6	25.7
UCSB	83.6	16.4	0	56.3	19.2	24.5
UCR	74.1	25.9	0	57.4	21.3	21.3
UCSC	69.0	31.0	0	38.5	33.3	28.2
Chico	51.7	48.3	0			
Fullerton	43.7	56.3	0	68.0	20.0	12.0
Sacramento	60.4	39.6	0		----omitted----	
San Francisco	57.5	42.5	0		----omitted----	
San Jose	64.1	35.9	0	73.9	17.4	8.7
				48.5	24.2	27.3
USC	55.3	44.7	0			
Cal Tech	63.0	37.0	0	68.2	18.2	13.6
Occidental	67.0	33.0	0	65.2	26.1	8.7
Claremont	67.5	32.5	0	68.4	21.1	10.5
Pomona	47.8	52.2	0	51.4	35.1	13.5
Stanford	63.8	36.2	0	61.5	38.5	0.0
Loyola	42.6	57.4	0	35.6	38.1	26.3
USF	37.5	62.5	0	69.0	14.3	16.7
				57.1	7.1	35.7

Table 6

Democratic & Republican
Nomination for Secretary of State

Campus	DEMOCRATIC					REPUBLICAN		
	Fong	O'Neill	Karabian	Sillas	Other	Van Camp	Montgomery	Other
UCB	64.7	18.9	11.7	1.6	3.1	31.8	31.1	37.1
UCLA	16.1	68.4	10.5	1.8	3.3	29.3	37.1	33.6
UCD	46.4	35.5	12.7	1.6	3.8	38.0	19.0	42.9
UCI	28.3	47.6	15.2	5.4	3.6	39.2	23.5	37.3
UCSD	30.1	43.9	13.7	6.5	5.9	33.3	37.7	29.0
UCSB	46.7	40.9	8.7	1.4	2.3	38.5	27.0	34.4
UCR	28.1	37.6	19.1	5.2	10.0	44.4	24.4	31.1
UCSC	62.4	23.7	4.9	4.5	4.5	40.0	11.4	48.6
Chico	52.5	11.0	21.0	3.9	11.6	43.1	9.8	47.1
Fullerton	40.0	33.3	20.0	0.0	6.7		----omitted----	
Sacramento	35.7	37.5	10.7	3.6	12.5		----omitted----	
San Francisco	54.7	5.8	32.6	0.0	7.0	28.6	23.8	47.6
San Jose	44.7	23.7	18.4	3.5	9.6	10.3	20.5	69.2
USC	21.1	65.4	5.8	3.9	3.9	22.2	27.8	50.0
Cal Tech	28.3	56.6	9.4	1.9	3.8	26.7	6.7	66.7
Occidental	24.1	40.5	27.6	3.5	4.3	42.1	31.6	26.3
Claremont	35.3	43.6	11.3	3.8	6.0	55.6	22.2	22.2
Pomona	27.3	36.4	22.7	9.1	4.5	23.1	30.8	46.2
Stanford	47.4	30.3	11.2	6.5	4.7	58.7	16.5	24.8
Loyola	7.2	68.6	18.3	0.7	5.2	29.4	17.7	52.9
USF	36.8	10.5	26.3	8.8	17.5	25.0	33.3	41.7

Table 7

Democratic & Republican
Nominations for Controller

Campus	DEMOCRATIC			REPUBLICAN		
	Mendelsohn	Cory	Other	Bagley	Flournoy	LaFollete
UCB	68.6	24.5	6.9	47.8	28.0	24.2
UCLA	59.7	29.4	10.9	47.8	25.8	26.4
UCD	51.5	33.2	15.2	57.0	25.7	17.3
UCI	39.8	51.2	9.0	41.9	38.7	19.4
UCSD	44.4	40.4	15.2	37.3	32.0	30.7
UCSB	67.8	23.6	8.5	26.9	44.9	28.1
UCR	65.6	29.0	5.4	44.2	34.6	21.2
UCSC	38.7	56.8	4.5	25.0	27.3	47.7
Chico	30.8	33.5	35.7	67.8	22.0	10.2
Fullerton	56.3	31.2	12.5		----omitted----	
Sacramento	38.5	48.1	13.5		----omitted----	
San Francisco	62.2	32.2	5.6	61.5	38.5	0.0
San Jose	47.7	39.4	12.8	32.4	29.4	38.2
USC	49.0	34.7	16.3	30.0	40.0	30.0
Cal Tech	55.1	34.7	10.2	39.1	17.4	43.5
Occidental	69.7	26.3	4.0	47.8	34.8	17.4
Claremont	49.6	37.0	13.5	50.0	30.6	19.4
Pomona	34.6	57.7	7.7	16.7	58.3	25.0
Stanford	40.6	40.2	19.2	53.1	24.5	22.4
Loyola	47.1	32.1	20.7	26.3	36.8	36.8
USF	56.6	28.3	15.1	37.5	50.0	12.5

Table 8

Ballot Measures

Campus	Prop. 1 Yes	Prop. 1 No	Prop. 2 Yes	Prop. 2 No	Prop. 5 Yes	Prop. 5 No	Prop. 7 Yes	Prop. 7 No	Prop. 9 Yes	Prop. 9 No
UCB	95.0	5.0	97.3	2.7	96.2	3.8	82.3	17.7	91.4	8.6
UCLA	89.2	10.8	94.0	6.0	91.9	8.1	66.8	33.2	91.4	8.6
UCD	94.2	5.8	96.6	3.4	94.7	5.3	74.4	25.6	87.4	12.6
UCI	89.8	10.2	95.8	4.2	91.5	8.5	66.0	34.0	93.5	6.5
UCSD	89.3	10.7	95.1	4.9	93.0	7.0	52.6	47.4	89.0	11.0
UCSB	93.1	6.9	97.0	3.0	94.9	5.1	76.2	23.8	95.5	4.5
UCR	90.9	9.1	96.0	4.0	90.5	9.4	71.8	28.2	83.6	16.4
UCSC	96.3	3.7	99.0	1.0	98.0	2.0	66.6	33.4	97.3	2.7
Chico	82.7	17.3	86.1	13.9	69.5	30.5	49.8	50.2	80.0	20.0
Fullerton	87.0	13.0	87.0	13.0	72.7	27.3	70.0	30.0	90.9	9.1
Sacramento	88.9	11.1	97.2	2.8	90.0	10.0	67.2	32.8	95.7	4.3
San Francisco	76.6	23.4	83.6	16.4	84.3	15.7	65.5	34.5	80.7	19.3
San Jose	85.8	14.2	89.4	10.6	87.6	12.4	55.4	44.6	82.7	17.3
USC	88.8	11.2	91.1	8.9	86.7	13.3	70.6	29.4	80.4	19.6
Cal Tech	92.7	7.3	93.8	6.2	97.4	2.6	67.0	33.0	89.2	10.8
Occidental	87.1	12.9	91.8	8.2	95.4	4.6	66.0	34.0	83.4	16.6
Claremont	91.6	8.4	97.6	2.4	95.8	4.2	77.0	23.0	91.2	8.8
Pomona	82.4	17.6	88.5	11.5	92.0	8.0	56.8	43.2	88.2	11.8
Stanford	93.5	6.5	97.6	2.4	92.9	7.1	78.7	21.3	91.4	8.6
Loyola	80.7	19.3	89.5	10.5	88.8	11.2	58.0	42.0	87.4	12.6
USF	87.7	12.3	88.2	11.2	90.0	10.0	68.5	31.5	73.5	26.5

Table 9

Selected Local Races[1]

Congressional Races

1. Special Election: Present 6th Congressional District (Non-Partisan)

Campus: S.F. State Precincts: 1 Voters: 126 Turnout: 30.2%

	Burton	Caylor	Others
District-wide vote	50.0	21.0	29.0
Student vote	62.7	16.7	20.6

2. Democratic Primary - 8th Congressional District

Campus: UC Berkeley Precincts: 12 Voters: 1844 Dem. Turnout: 47.0%

	Dellums(Inc.)	Aller	Murphy	Others
District-wide vote	68.3	21.2	10.6	0.0
Student vote	89.6	7.9	2.3	0.3

3. Republican Primary - 12th Congressional District

Campus: Stanford Precincts: 11 Voters: 1420 Rep. Turnout: 67.3%

	McCloskey(Inc.)	Knapp	Fredrich
District-wide vote	49.8	48.3	1.9
Student vote	90.7	7.8	1.5

4. Democratic Primary - 12th Congressional District

Campus: Stanford Precincts: 11 Voters: 979 Dem. Turnout: 41.5%

	Gillmoor	Rhodes	Skornia	Spitters
District-wide vote	31.9	20.4	29.2	18.5
Student vote	8.7	21.8	49.4	20.0

5. Democratic Primary - 16th Congressional District

Campus: UC Santa Cruz Precincts: 6 Voter: 1351 Dem. Turnout: 65.3%

	Camacho	Flagg	Harry
District-wide vote	61.7	17.7	20.6
Student vote	87.3	3.5	9.2

---

1. This is a sampling of races in which student voting patterns differed significantly from the general voting population.

Table 9 (cont.)

6. Democratic Primary - 43rd Congressional District

Campus: UC San Diego Precicnts: 4 Voters: 237 Turnout:[1] 45.0%

	Bandes	Rock	Ascherfeld
District-wide vote	49.1	29.4	21.5
Student vote	90.3	3.8	5.9

State Senatorial Races

1. Democratic Primary - 18th Senatorial District

Campus: UC Santa Barbara Precincts:12 Voters: 2046 Turnout:[1] 43.0%

	Rains	Kinney	Others
District-wide vote	30.0	28.4	41.6
Student vote	54.2	42.7	3.1

2. Republican Primary - 22nd Senatorial District

Campus: UCLA Precincts: 7 Voters: 122 Rep. Turnout: 36.6%

	Bauer	Finer
District-wide vote	53.1	46.9
Student vote	33.6	66.4

3. Democratic Primary - 30th Senatorial District

Campus: Loyola Precincts: 1 Voters: 129 Dem. Turnout: 42.3%

	Holden	Holoman	Others
District-wide vote	44.1	42.5	13.4
Student vote	22.5	55.0	22.5

State Assembly Races

1. Democratic Primary - 4th Assembly District

Campus: UC Davis Precincts: 7 Voters: 1070 Dem. Turnout: 50.0%

	Z'berg(Inc.)	Genshlea	Others
District-wide votes	53.4	29.7	16.9
Student vote	47.7	48.1	4.2

2. Republican Primary - 12th Assembly District

Campus: UC Berkeley Precincts: 12 Voters: 169 Rep. Turnout: 39.2%

	Flegal	McLaren	Others
District-wide vote	59.7	40.3	0.0
Student vote	45.6	53.8	0.6

---

1. Partisan turnout not available.

Table 9 (cont.)

3. Republican Primary - 35th Assembly District

Campus: UC Santa Barbara Precincts: 12 Voters: 147 Turnout:[1] 43.0%

	Terry	Brazelton	Elliott
District-wide vote	51.1	35.1	13.9
Student vote	32.0	46.9	21.1

1. Partisan turnout not available.

Table 10

Colleges and Universities Examined

University of California Campuses

Berkeley
Los Angeles
Davis
Irvine
San Diego
Santa Barbara
Riverside
Santa Cruz

Calif. State Universities and Colleges

Chico[1]
Fullerton[1]
Sacramento[1]
San Francisco[1]
San Jose[1]

Private Universities and Colleges

University of Southern California[1]
California Institute of Technology
Occidental College[1]
Claremont Men's College[1]
Pomona College[1]
Stanford University
Loyola-Marymount College[1]
University of San Francisco[1]

1. College was out of session or in middle of the final exam period on June 4; consequently, turnout was low.